Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

		Application No.	Applicant(s)
Office Action Summary		10/075,642	YOKOSHI, NORIYUKI
		Examiner	Art Unit	
		Cam Y T. Truong	2162	

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE <u>3</u> MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.
- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133).
- Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

1)☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on *03 January 2006*.

2a)☒ This action is **FINAL**.   2b)☐ This action is non-final.

3)☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

4)☒ Claim(s) *1-22* is/are pending in the application.

    4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.

5)☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.

6)☒ Claim(s) *1-22* is/are rejected.

7)☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.

8)☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

9)☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.

10)☐ The drawing(s) filed on _____ is/are: a)☐ accepted or b)☐ objected to by the Examiner.

    Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).

    Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).

11)☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

12)☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).

    a)☐ All b)☐ Some * c)☐ None of:

      1.☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.

      2.☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.

      3.☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

    * See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

1) ☐ Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)

2) ☐ Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)

3) ☐ Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449 or PTO/SB/08) Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____.

4) ☐ Interview Summary (PTO-413) Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____.

5) ☐ Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152)

6) ☐ Other: _____.

DETAILED ACTION

1.   Claims 1-22 are pending in this Office Action.

Response to Arguments

2.   Applicant's arguments filed 1/3/2006 have been fully considered but they are not

persuasive.

First, applicant argued that Bapat did not teach the claimed limitation "the MO

having a table storing information on the state of the external apparatus; wherein the

MO is provided inside the database so as to have a table storing information on the

state of the apparatus".

In response: Bapat teaches the claimed limitations:

"the MO having a table storing information on the state of the external apparatus"

as the DB object having a table storing each type of event of a customer computer (fig.

9, col. 29, lines 30-35);

"wherein the MO is provided inside the database so as to have a table storing

information on the state of the apparatus" as the access control database consists of a

hierarchy of objects. The object has a table storing each type of event of a customer

computer (col. 5, lines 20-25; col. 29, lines 30-35; col. 4, lines 1-67).

Finally, applicant argued that the combination of Bapat and Ng is improper from

the claimed invention.

In response: The examiner respectfully agrees with the applicant that Bapat discloses the objective of the system is to restrict a user's access to objects that using a database.

However, as discussed in the office action, Bapat also provides another aspect of a system and method for storing and accessing information in a database (col. 3, lines 25-40).

Similarly, Ng teaches storing and accessing information in a database (col. 4, lines 25-40).

Importantly, Ng provides an **advantage** of including in the DBMS stored procedures, which allow users to develop software routines that manipulate tables and data in a database (col. 4, lines 45-50).

Clearly, the applied references, Ward and Robertson are all concerned storing and accessing information in a database. Thus, these references are analogous and within the same aspects of endeavor and are combinable.

As discussed above, a person of an ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made would recognize the advantage of Ng to add the DBMS includes stored procedures, which allow users to develop software routines that manipulate tables and data in a database to Bapat's system in order to allow users to access and modify tables of data in the database corresponding to operations performed on objects (col. 4, lines 45-55).

Therefore, the 103 rejection is proper and make the record clear.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

3.   The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all

obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

> (a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negatived by the manner in which the invention was made.

4.   Claims 1, 2, 10-13, 21 and 22 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being

unpatentable over Bapat et al (or hereinafter "Bapat") (UPS 6236996) in view of Ng (US

6374256).

As to claim 1, Bapat teaches the claimed limitations:

'a database" as database (fig. 10; col. 16, lines 40-45);

"managed object (MO) managing the state of the external apparatus" col. 5, lines 20-25;

col. 29, lines 30-35; col. 4, lines 1-67);

"the MO being provided in said database and realized by an application" as the

DB object having a table storing each type of event of a customer computer (fig. 9, col.

29, lines 30-35);

"the MO having a table storing information on the state of the external

apparatus" as the access control database consists of a hierarchy of objects. The

object has a table storing each type of event of a customer computer (col. 5, lines 20-

25; col. 29, lines 30-35; col. 4, lines 1-67);

"and a control interface through which said MO perform outer control of the external apparatus from said database, the interface being provided in said MO" as the DBMS 280 has an access privileges module 284, which configures access rights to each of the tables in the DBMS. For instance, the access privileges module 284 may have an access privileges table that stores access rights information indicating which users have access to the tables that make up the event logs 282. An access privileges module 284 is represented as a control interface. DBMS is realized by user or application (col. 16, lines 44-50; fig. 1, col. 4, lines 60-67).

Bapat does not explicitly teach "a stored procedure defining a method related to the table". Ng teaches the DBMS includes stored procedures, which allow users to develop software routines that manipulate tables and data in a database (col. 4, lines 45-50).

It would have been obvious to a person of an ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to apply Ng's teaching the DBMS includes stored procedures, which allow users to develop software routines that manipulate tables and data in a database to Bapat's system in order to allow users to access and modify tables of data in the database corresponding to operations performed on objects (col. 4, lines 45-55).

As to claim 2, Bapat teaches the claimed limitation "a result notification interface for notifying said database of a result of the outer control performed by said MO with the result being correlated with the control, the result notification interface being provided in MO" as (col. 5, lines 40-50).

As to claims 10 and 21, Bapat teaches the claimed limitation "wherein said control interface is provided with a function of extending transaction processing in said database" as (col. 24, lines 20-30).

As to claims 11 and 22, Bapat teach the claimed limitation "wherein control of establishing a session with said database is extended so that operations of a plurality of users are performed as one transaction" as when view are generated for groups of users instead of individual users, each group of users corresponds to one of the group objects in the access control tree and each view is usable by just one group of users. Each authorized user, when logging onto the DBMS, is identified as a member of one of the groups for which views have been generated. If a user is a member of more than one group, the user is required to identify the group access rights that the user will be using when accessing data in the DBMS. In cases, each access group includes many users; thus, when users of group request access, the system only need to perform all of users' requests as one transaction. Users' requests are represented as operations (col. 24, lines 5-20).

As to claim 12, Bapat teaches the claimed limitations:

"the method realizing a managed object (MO) by an application" as DBMS is realized by user or application (fig. 1, col. 4, lines 60-67);

"storing the state of the apparatus in a database" as database table storing data or information of a user computer as external apparatus (fig. 10; col. 16, lines 40-45);

"the MO managing the state of the apparatus, performs outer control of the apparatus therefrom via a control interface" as the DBMS 280 has an access privileges module 284, which configures access rights to each of the tables in the DBMS. For instance, the access privileges module 284 may have an access privileges table that stores access rights information indicating which users have access to the tables that make up the event logs 282. An access privileges module 284 is represented as a control interface (col. 16, lines 44-50);

"wherein the MO is provided inside the database so as to have a table storing information on the state of the apparatus" as the access control database consists of a hierarchy of objects. The object has a table storing each type of event of a customer computer (col. 5, lines 20-25; col. 29, lines 30-35; col. 4, lines 1-67).

Bapat does not explicitly teach "a stored procedure defining a method related to the table". Ng teaches the DBMS includes stored procedures, which allow users to develop software routines that manipulate tables and data in a database (col.4, lines 45-50).

It would have been obvious to a person of an ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to apply Ng's teaching the DBMS includes stored procedures, which allow users to develop software routines that manipulate tables and data in a database to Bapat's system in order to allow users to access and modify tables of data in the database corresponding to operations performed on objects (col. 4, lines 45-55).

As to claim 13, Bapat teaches the claimed limitation "wherein said database is notified of a result of the outer control via a result notification interface provided in the MO with the result being correlated with the control" as (col. 5, lines 35-55).

5.　　Claims 3 and 14 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Bapat et al (or hereinafter "Bapat") (UPS 6236996) in view of Ng and further in view of Iwayama et al (or hereinafter "Iwayama") (UPS 6735615).

As to claim 3, Bapat and Ng disclose the claimed limitation subject matter in claim 1, except the claimed limitation "a change notification interface for notifying said MO of a change in the state of the external apparatus, the change notification interface being provide in said MO". Iwayama teaches DBMS 1 monitors the status of DB1 and notification of a status change of DB1 is to be sent to the agent terminal A and B. The above information shows that DBMS 1 has included a change notification interface to sent the notification of a status change of DB1 to the agent terminal A and B (col. 9, lines 35-38).

It would have been obvious to a person of an ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to apply Iwayama's teaching of DBMS 1 monitors the status of DB1 and notification of a status change of DB1 is to be sent to the agent terminal A and B to Bapat and Ng in order to let a user know the status of a database before updating information in the database correctly.

As to claim 14, Bapat and Ng disclose the claimed limitation subject matter in claim 1, except the claimed limitation "wherein the MO is notified of a change in the state of the apparatus provided external to the database via a change notification interface provided in the MO". Iwayama teaches DBMS 1 monitors the status of DB1 and notification of a status change of DB1 is to be sent to the agent terminal A and B. The above information shows that DBMS 1 has included a change notification interface to sent the notification of a status change of DB1 to the agent terminal A and B (col. 9, lines 35-38).

It would have been obvious to a person of an ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to apply Iwayama's teaching of DBMS 1 monitors the status of DB1 and notification of a status change of DB1 is to be sent to the agent terminal A and B to Bapat and Ng in order to let a user know the status of a database before updating information in the database correctly.

6.   Claims 4-9, 15-20 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Bapat et al (or hereinafter "Bapat") (UPS 6236996) in view of Ng and further in view of Guck (USP 5848415).

As to claims 4 and 15, Bapat and Ng disclose the claimed limitation subject matter in claim 1, except the claimed limitation "a protocol conversion part converting a first protocol into a second protocol for transmitting information between said database and the external apparatus". Guck teaches server manages the client as the external apparatus by converting object protocol to initiate a protocol envelope to deliver

document content from a message protocol orientation to a file protocol orientation (col. 15, lines 15-20).

It would have been obvious to a person of an ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to apply Guck's teaching of server manages the client as the external apparatus by converting object to initiate a protocol envelope to deliver document content from a message protocol orientation to a file protocol orientation to Bapat and Ng in order to provide different types of communications and to transfer data of a database to different location and format system via Internet system easily based on user's request.

As to claim 5, Bapat and Ng disclose the claimed limitation subject matter in claim 4, except the claimed limitation "wherein said database and said protocol conversion part comprise server computer managing the external apparatus". Guck teaches server manages the client as the external apparatus by converteing object to initiate a protocol envelope to deliver document content from a message protocol orientation to a file protocol orientation (col. 15, lines 15-20).

It would have been obvious to a person of an ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to apply Guck's teaching of server manages the client as the external apparatus by converting object to initiate a protocol envelope to deliver document content from a message protocol orientation to a file protocol orientation to Bapat and Ng in order to provide different types of communications and to transfer data

of a database to different location and format system via Internet system easily based on user's request.

As to claim 6, Bapat teaches the claimed limitation " wherein said MO performs outer control or a notification is transmitted to said MO from outside before said database completes transaction processing requested by a user application connected to the apparatus" as (fig. 16 C, col. 16, lines 40-55).

As to claim 7, Bapat teaches the claimed limitation "further comprising an event notification interface for notifying the user application of an event, the event notification interface being provided in said MO" as (col. 5, lines 35-55).

As to claims 8 and 19, Bapat teaches the claimed limitation "wherein an operation statement for operating said MO is provided in a query language for posing a query to said database from the user application" as (col. 16, lines 30-40).

As to claims 9 and 20, Bapat teaches the claimed limitation "wherein said MO is operated by using a reference statement of a query language for posing a query to said database from the user application" as (col. 16, lines 30-40).

As to claim 16, Bapat and Ng disclose the claimed limitation subject matter in claim 1, except the claimed limitation "the database and the protocol conversion part

manages the apparatus connected to the server computer". Guck teaches server manages the client as the external apparatus by converteing object to initiate a protocol envelope to deliver document content from a message protocol orientation to a file protocol orientation (col. 15, lines 15-20).

It would have been obvious to a person of an ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to apply Guck's teaching of server manages the client as the external apparatus by converting object to initiate a protocol envelope to deliver document content from a message protocol orientation to a file protocol orientation to Bapat and Ng in order to provide different types of communications and to transfer data of a database to different location and format system via Internet system easily based on user's request.

As to claim 17, Bapat teaches the claimed limitation "wherein the MO performs outer control or a notification is transmitted to MO from outside before the databse completes transaction processing requested by a user application connected to the server computer" as (fig. 16 C, col. 16, lines 40-55).

As to claim 18, Bapat teaches the claimed limitation "wherein the user application is notified of an event via an event notification interface provided in the MO" as (fig. 16 C, col. 16, lines 40-55).

7.   Claim 4 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Bapat et al (or hereinafter "Bapat") (UPS 6236996) in view of Ng and further Wardin et al (or hereinafter "Wardin") (UPS 6459779).

As to claim 4, Bapat and Ng disclose the claimed limitation subject matter in claim 1, except the claimed limitation "a protocol conversion part converting a first protocol into a second protocol for transmitting information between said database and the external apparatus". Wardin teaches the second terminating name module converts the EDA protocol into the protocol required by the database and performs the query. After the database return a response to the query, the second terminating name module converts the database protocol back into the EDA protocol and sends the response to the first terminating name module (col. 3, lines 45-55).

It would have been obvious to a person of an ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to apply Wardin's teaching of the second terminating name module converts the EDA protocol into the protocol required by the database and performs the query. After the database return a response to the query, the second terminating name module converts the database protocol back into the EDA protocol and sends the response to the first terminating name module to Bapat and Ng in order to transfer data of a database to different location and format system via Internet system easily.

8.   Claims 5-9 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Bapat et al (or hereinafter "Bapat") (UPS 6236996) in view of Ng and further Wardin et al (or hereinafter "Wardin") (UPS 6459779) and Guck.

As to claim 5, Bapat and Ng and Wardin disclose the claimed limitation subject matter in claim 4, except the claimed limitation "wherein said database and said protocol conversion part comprise server computer managing the external apparatus". Guck teaches server manages the client as the external apparatus by converteing object to initiate a protocol envelope to deliver document content from a message protocol orientation to a file protocol orientation (col. 15, lines 15-20).

It would have been obvious to a person of an ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to apply Guck's teaching of server manages the client as the external apparatus by converting object to initiate a protocol envelope to deliver document content from a message protocol orientation to a file protocol orientation to Bapat, Ng and Wardin in order to provide different types of communications and to transfer data of a database to different location and format system via Internet system easily based on user's request.

As to claim 6, Bapat teaches the claimed limitation " wherein said MO performs outer control or a notification is transmitted to said MO from outside before said database completes transaction processing requested by a user application connected to the apparatus" as (fig. 16 C, col. 16, lines 40-55).

As to claim 7, Bapat teaches the claimed limitation "further comprising an event notification interface for notifying the user application of an event, the event notification interface being provided in said MO" as (col. 5, lines 35-55).

As to claim 8, Bapat teaches the claimed limitation "wherein an operation statement for operating said MO is provided in a query language for posing a query to said database from the user application" as (col. 16, lines 30-40).

As to claim 9, Bapat teaches the claimed limitation "wherein said MO is operated by using a reference statement of a query language for posing a query to said database from the user application" as (col. 16, lines 30-40).

Conclusion

9.   **THIS ACTION IS MADE FINAL.** Applicant is reminded of the extension of time policy as set forth in 37 CFR 1.136(a).

A shortened statutory period for reply to this final action is set to expire THREE MONTHS from the mailing date of this action. In the event a first reply is filed within TWO MONTHS of the mailing date of this final action and the advisory action is not mailed until after the end of the THREE-MONTH shortened statutory period, then the shortened statutory period will expire on the date the advisory action is mailed, and any extension fee pursuant to 37 CFR 1.136(a) will be calculated from the mailing date of the advisory action. In no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire later than SIX MONTHS from the mailing date of this final action.

Contact Information

10.   Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Cam Y T Truong whose telephone number is (571) 272-4042. The examiner can normally be reached on Monday to Firday.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, John Breene can be reached on (571) 272-4107. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 703-872-9306.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see http://pair-direct.uspto.gov. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free).

Cam-Y Truong
Primary Examiner
Art Unit 2162
3/14/2006